



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

encourage him to the utmost by their pecuniary support, especially as professors, editors, and college students, to say nothing of the general reader of popular dialect novels and tales, are likely at any time to have occasion to consult this invaluable repertory of information concerning provincial words. Subscriptions may be sent direct to Professor Wright, 6 Norham Road, Oxford, and it is to be hoped that many more will reach him before the next part appears, especially as the complete list of subscribers will be printed when Vol. I. is completed.

ALBERT S. COOK.

YALE UNIVERSITY.

Det Arnamagnæanske Haandskrift 310 quarto. Saga Olafs konungs Tryggvasonar er ritadi Oddr muncr. En gammel norsk bearbejdelse af Odd Snorresøns paa latin skrevne Saga om Kong Olaf Tryggvason. Udgivet for det Norske Historiske Kildeskriftfond af P. Groth. Christiania. Grøndahl & Sons Bøgtrykkeri. 1895.

THE historical value of Odd's report on King Olaf Tryggvason, its close connection with other sögur, and the fact that it apparently was the source of several of the most important among them, made an accurate study of the whole material in question very desirable indeed. Many problems were still waiting for a positive answer: To what extent did the author of *Fagrskinna*, of *Flateyrbók*, *Snorre*, and other writers borrow from Odd directly or from one of his translators? and in the latter case which of them did they follow? where did they copy each other? and did not, in turn, the one or the other of them furnish some material to Odd himself, or to some of his translators? Indeed, there still existed much difference of opinion as to the more fundamental questions: what is the age and character and the relative value of the three known versions of Odd's work? which of them represents most faithfully the original?

What now appears to be the main text, (*A*), the Arnamagnæan manuscript, was available only in a somewhat antiquated edition, in the collection of *Fornmanna Sögur*, Vol. X., and it had never been studied with philological accuracy. It was not astonishing, therefore, that *Munch* — who in 1853 edited the other two versions, (*B*) the Stockholm Ms., and (*C*) the Uppsalafragment — and *Storm* in his

Latinske Kildeskrifter til Norges Historie i Middelalderen, and *Morgenstern*, and more recently *B. M. Olsen*, came to very different results with regard to most of the questions mentioned above. In 1886, at his teacher's, G. Storm's, own suggestion, our editor undertook what he intended to be 'en fuldt paalidelig og nøiagtig udgave' of *A*; his edition is now before us, and so far as one can judge from the editor's method and from the whole character of his book, it appears to be a diplomatically exact rendering of the Ms. All the manifold forms of letters used in the codex, — such as *d*, *ð*, *ḑ*, *þ*; *u*, *v*, *p*, *f*, etc., are equally distinguished in the printed text; even evident mistakes of the scribe are reproduced in the text, but usually indicated as such in the notes, and, besides, they are treated together in a special chapter. The abbreviations of the Ms. are also treated in a chapter of their own, while in the text itself all forms are printed in full, the part abbreviated in the codex being indicated by italics. Footnotes give further information on individual passages, and the whole is followed by a brief synopsis of the different chapters, together with additional notes of a textcritical nature, and by a very welcome index of proper names.

In short, the edition is a strictly philological one, and yet, while it must be admitted that the book is anything but attractive, typographically,¹ the text will be found readable enough even by those who are interested in literary or historical questions only. Moreover, the historian — who would care but little for the minutiae of Old Norse philology — will readily become reconciled with the editor's method, when he considers the wealth of new results which it has yielded. We will here review some of the more important ones.

The character of the Ms. is studied on the first forty-eight pages of the introduction, and a number of interesting points are brought out. From the next to consistent use of *ð* for later *d*, and the frequent occurrence of *ḑ*, along with *þ*, the editor concludes, correctly, that the Ms. was probably written during the first half of the thirteenth century, not towards the end of the same, as had been commonly supposed. Other features, mainly the use of *æ* for *e* (in *ær*, *æn*, etc.), the interchange between *a* and *o* for the *u*-umlaut of *a*, the correct distinction between the sign for *þ*, *ð* on the one hand and *æ* on the other, perhaps the initial *u* in *uurḑu*, *uox*, etc., point at a

¹ Few misprints seem to have escaped the editor's attention; we notice on page 42 *gange* for *gange*, page 45 *Allgemeimen* for *Allgemeinen*, page 62 *mun* for *nun*.

Norwegian, not an Icelandic scribe, while in the form *iak* for *ek*, and the use of *en* as conditional conjunction, Swedish influence is perceptible. The seemingly indiscriminate use of forms with and without initial *h* before *l*, *n*, and *r* is accounted for by the theory that the learned, conservative scribe had a preference for the archaic spelling with *h*, but in many cases, quite especially in words of a popular character, he unwittingly yielded to the common habit of his own time and country. The forms with *h*- do therefore not prove Icelandic origin or influence. All this is plausible enough, and the Norwegian origin of the Ms. may well be regarded as safely and definitely established. In regard to a few details, we would differ with the editor's interpretation of the Ms. spelling. His conclusion, against Hoffory, that medial *f* before voiced consonants was voiceless, is untenable; it surely is not acceptable for the whole of Norwegian, and although the usage of our Ms. seems to indicate a (dialectal?) difference between medial *f* before vowels and before voiced consonants, the latter was not necessarily voiceless, but may have had a narrower lip articulation than between vowels. As to *z*, it must be admitted that this letter does not invariably stand for *ts*; it occurs for *s*, *st*, and possibly for *ʃs*, but it is safe to say, that *d* and *ð* became unvoiced before *s*(*k*), and that *z*, in such cases, indicates *ts* and *ʃs*, not *ds* or *ðs*. Nor did the *-k* of the reflexive pronoun owe its retention to a dynamic reason, such as Groth suggests on page 38: '*k*-lyden i refleksivendelsen har sandsynligvis kun holdt sig i saadane tilfælde, hvor *z* paa grund af en foregaaende dental ikke i og for sig var tilstrækkelig tydeligt refleksivmærke.' The fate of the *-k*, as also that of the dental preceding the *s*-, depended primarily upon the character of the preceding and following sounds; later the *-k* was gradually eliminated by analogy. But these details of phonology have no direct bearing on the character of our text, and for the present we return to the latter.

The next important point which is also decided definitely, I believe, is the fact that our Ms. is a direct translation from the Latin original. A large number of peculiar expressions, different from common usage and not to be found in the two other versions, or in the *Islendingabók*, point clearly at the immediate influence of the Latin prototype. Thus, the exceedingly frequent use of *at* with the dative of a noun and a participle is apparently a rendering of the Latin ablativus absolutus, f. i. *at bioðanda bonða*, where *B* has *síþan melli buande*; *at einum aftecnum*, as against *B*: *nema einn lutr*; *at*

liðnum III nottum, for *B*: *sveckurum dagum sibarr*, etc. Another significant construction the editor finds in: *at hann mætti allum auðsær vera oc mal hans at heyra*. In this phrase, he says, there is nothing upon which the *at heyra* could grammatically depend; it is the idea of 'easy,' contained in *auðsær*, which governs the *at heyra*; *auðsær*, however, renders a Latin *facilis visu*, and upon this *facilis* the following verb also depended in the original. This explanation, ingenious as it may be, is yet very unsafe, and, I believe, unnecessary. In the first place, the Latin, with *facilis* belonging to two nouns and governing two supines, would not read very smoothly: '*Ut (Olaus) facilis esset visu atque vox eius auditu.*' On the other hand, *B* has here as second part of the phrase: *oc allir metti mal hans heyra*; this points at a Latin *atque vox eius omnibus esset audibilis*, or *ab omnibus audiri posset*, and why should not this be rendered in Old Norwegian by the current construction, *allum mætti vera* (like *verða*) *at heyra*? Another passage which Groth does not seem to explain quite satisfactorily is *tóc hann þa við trausti þrónða fyrst at upphafi. oc gauldóla*. *B* has here *ok tok hann þa við trausti Gauldóla at upphafe. ok þar með allra þrenda*, while in *Fagrskinna* the corresponding passage reads: *tóku allir þrónðir vel við hanum ok fyrst Gauldólir*. The question is, does the passage in *A* mean the same as the two others? Groth says, against Morgenstern, that it does, and I believe he is right, but I cannot accept his explanation of the difficulty. He quotes the use of Latin *que* as *explicativum*; however, as long as *fyrst at upphafi* refers to the *þrónðir*, the *oc* may at the most (= *que explicativum*) mean 'and among others also,' 'and especially also,' but never 'and first of all.' Considering the rather mechanical way in which the Latin text has been translated throughout, it may be permitted rather to detach *fyrst at upphafi* from *þrónða* entirely, to put a comma after *þrónða* instead of after *upphafi*, and to understand *fyrst at 'upphafi oc G.* as rendering a Latin *primumque G.* In any case, the evidence presented by Groth sufficiently proves that *A* is a direct translation from the Latin. This refers also to the chapter on the introduction of Christianity into Iceland, which was not taken from *Islendingabók*; the probability, indeed, is that Odd himself made use of Arne's report for a later revision of his work.

In the following chapter the editor compares our Ms. with *B* and *C*, and he finds that *B*, the shorter version, is more remote from the original than either *A* or *C*. *B* quotes Odd, while *A* and *C* trans-

late his history. Again, *A* and *C* represent two different phases in the development of Odd's own work ; between them there came the revision to which the author submitted his report in accordance with the advice of Gissurr Hallson. After quoting some of his main authorities, Odd himself says, on page 120 of our edition, *Ec synda oc bokina Gitsure hallz syni oc retta ec hana eptir hans raðe. oc hapum ver þui hallðit sipan.*

Thus it appears, that several passages which are lacking in *C* or in *B*, and which were supposed to have gotten into *A* from other sources, may well have been inserted by Odd himself, *A* representing the revised version and *C* the earlier form of his history. Concerning Odd's relation to other contemporary and later writers we learn, that only in revising his work did he make use of *Thjodrek's* history, while nothing proves his indebtedness to the author of the *historia Norvegiæ*. As to *Fagrskinna*, the editor shows, against Morgenstern and in continuation of G. Storm's investigations, — whose results are somewhat modified, — that our translator did not use Fgrsk., and that Fgrsk. used neither *A* nor *B*, but a version more explicit than the latter, perhaps a Latin text, or a translation different from any of the three we know. *Snorre Sturlassön*, of course, used Odd's work directly and also through the medium of Fgrsk., as G. Storm has shown in his *Sn. St.'s Historieskrivning*; but which version did he follow? Groth, taking issue again with Morgenstern, concludes, that *Heimskringla* as well as, directly or indirectly, the later large history of King Olaf and the *Flateyrbók* followed a text which in many respects resembled *A*, simply because the latter represents the original most faithfully.

We have been able to report only the main results of Groth's investigations. His book modifies, in a number of important points, our views of Old Norse grammar and historiography. We hope that it will find its way into many Germanistic libraries and contribute its share towards securing for Scandinavian studies the place which they deserve to hold in our discipline.

GUSTAF E. KARSTEN.